DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 044 EC 232 696

AUTHOR Thomas, David
TITLE Reflective or Reactive Pupils and Teachers? Special Educator or Special Trainer? Role Dilemmas for Teachers and Education Tutors.
PUB DATE Aug 90
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the International Special Education Congress (Cardiff, Wales, United Kingdom, July 30-August 3, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; *Disabilities; *Educational Methods; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Special Education; *Special Education Teachers; Student Educational Objectives; *Teacher Education; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Role; Teaching Styles
IDENTIFIERS *Great Britain

ABSTRACT

The special educator's role and training is discussed within the context of current efforts by British schools to comply with the Education Reform Act and the National Curriculum. The close relationship between the process and content of learning and between styles of learning and learning outcomes is stressed. Individual sections address the following ideas and issues: "Touchstones" (a thematic approach to student assessment); the teaching process as the learning product; process definition with emphasis on the relationship between teacher and pupil; concerns with the heavy use of structured learning in special schools; questions about the usefulness of the objectives model and skills analysis paradigm to produce student autonomy and independence; similar concerns raised by teachers; the teacher as a reflective practitioner; and the training and education of teachers. Includes 16 references. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED327044

Reflective or Reactive pupils and teachers ? Special educator or special trainer? role dilemmas for teachers and education tutors.

Paper delivered at the International Special Education Congress, ISEC 1990, Cardiff, Wales, UK, July 30th to August 3rd 1990 by

David Thomas
Senior Lecturer in Education
Department of Education
University of Liverpool
PB Box 147
Liverpool L69 3BX UK

EC 233696

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David Thomas
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Reflective or Reactive pupils and teachers ? Special educator or special trainer? role dilemmas for teachers and education tutors.

Introduction

When I offered to give a paper at this Conference I selected a theme that was then a concern of mine. I should have realised that that was then and this is now. If a week is along time in politics then in the current British educational scene a year is several life times. There has been a quantum leap in the pace of change which we have experienced since Mr Baker announced the intention to present a Bill which would Reform Education. In some ways it would have been wiser to have chosen a theme of urgent topicality - such as 'Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles Meet the Schools Examination and Assessment Council or 'Local Management of Schools; a post-structuralist perspective' or even 'The Education Reform Act:an '80's solution to a problem identified in the '70's based on findings from the '60's using research methods devised for the '50's? Despite temptations to stray into topicality I shall attempt to introduce my original theme with one modification which is of some significance, namely adding the word 'Tutors' to 'Teachers' making it 'role dilemmas for teachers and tutors'.

In the short time available to me I shall have to restrict myself to the bare bones of the argument. I also wish to note that the sequencing of these ideas is due to the way in which I experienced them and not necessarily in the order that strict logic would dictate. I suspect that this how most of us work anyway as we attempt to make sense of the world as experienced.

1. Touchstones

The first event was my work in a First School in Liverpool working with and observing teachers attempting to use a very early, and somewhat primitive version of a thematic approach to assessing C.A.7+ children of varied ability developed by the NFER called 'Touchstones'.[1] In spite of its limitations it provided me with the invaluable experience of seeing how complex the task of assessing pupils over the three core subjects of the National Curriculum [English, Maths and Science] would be within an ordinary classroom with a mere twenty-seven children! Multiplying the number of Attainment Targets to be assessed by core subjects and by pupils yielded a very depressing large number.[2]

The experience also provided fascinating hints on the problems associated with the interaction of teacher expectation and actual pupil performance, on the subjective nature of some assessments, of assessing special needs pupils and especially

the problems of assessing pupils in groups while coping with the rest of the class.

But what I wanted to draw from that experience is the obvious but important point that the Education Reform Act [ERA] and in particular the National Curriculum [3] is presenting a new set of training needs as far as teachers are concerned.

These, at the Primary School level involved the acquisition of new content - Science is the glaring example but there are others in the pipe line such as Music as a Foundation subject and Physical Education which will have new 'content' implications. Not only new content but new skills are demanded by the Assessment imperatives. New skills in communicating and interpreting results to parents and pupils as well as school governors are also needed.

This list could be extended but it will suffice to make clear that the ERA and the NC have changed the 'content-skill' agenda for teacher in-service [INSET] requirements as well as changing initial teacher training. But more than the 'content-skill' agenda has changed: there has been a significant change in the traditional relationship between users and the suppliers of INSET. Training is now portrayed as a 'consumer-led' activity. In fact it is led by the moment to moment demands of the NC. Assessment is the 'flavour of the month' so two training days are given over to it. It is characterised as responsive to 'local' needs but this is only partially true. The point I wish to draw out here is that not only is the 'content-skill' agenda changed, the 'context' of teacher training has profoundly altered. What the 'context-content' changes seem to imply is that teacher INSET is seen as pragmatic, specific and technical in character.

Some of the implications of that point will be considered later.

2. Process is Product

This next section is something of a 'knight's move' rather than an advance of pawns. It is headed 'Product is Process'. It supports the view that that the content of teaching is never value free and goes further by asserting that neither is method.

That is, you never get the same results by using different methods; different methods always produce different results. Another way of saying this is 'teaching styles are never neutral'. Teaching styles or methods are loaded with social, political and philosophical meanings. In some societies and in particular therapeutic institutions the 'manner' of instruction, or relationships is understood to be more significant than content.

The way we teach our pupils is what they learn. It is like the way we 'parent'; it is not so much what we say, our children learn from how we say it and what we do .

This way of looking at teaching and learning suggests that an important dimension is the relationship between teacher and taught. Process equals product whether we are considering an class of Infants, adolescents with Severe Learning Disabilities, Post Graduate Certificate of Education students or experienced teachers in INSET.

3. Defining the process

If this view is taken on board then it becomes vital to define the kind of processes which need to be central in teaching. One aspect of this central process is the explicit or implicit definition of the relationship between teacher and pupil or student and tutor. One dimension of that relationship is dominance and control vs equity and reciprocity.

Out of such considerations come profound notions about what teaching is. Let me polarise one aspect of teaching which goes to the heart of the matter. For some teachers [at any level within the system] teaching, at its core, is 'a human experience full of unpredictable moments'[4]

For these teachers teaching is a relationship in which equity and reciprocity are given prominence, where genuine dialogue is facilitated, the subject matter for learning is open to a measure of negotiation, where learning is alive and the motives for learning are intrinsic and where outcomes which are uncertain welcomed.

By contrast there are teachers whose art and craft is focused upon the reduction of uncertainty to zero. The minimisation of uncertainty depends upon a certain absolutism over classroom experience. These are the teachers who with sound intentions define, limit and control classroom experiences. They evaluate educational experiences and 'know' what has to be learned and are skilled in producing just that kind of outcome in the learner. Motives for learning are likely to be understood as extrinsic and it is the task of the teacher to supply the necessary carrots and sticks.

It should be understood that learners under these contrasting regimes are transformed though in different ways.

4.Critique of structured learning in special schools

In visiting some special schools I was struck by the way the notion of 'zero unpredictability' had become both the dominant pedagogy and a virtually unchallengeable ideology. This approach I call 'over-structured' learning. On a personal note I have to recall that a number of years ago I wrote the

first paper to appear in a UK 'Special Needs' journal on 'Behaviour Modification'.[5] It foreshadowed the growing pre-eminence of of this approach which can be linked to the curriculum movement which emphasises precision in educational objectives, pre-specifying outcomes, planned approaches to reward and motivation and detailed recording of pupil progress;the check-list syndrome. Structured learning has become the pedagogy of choice. [There is a paper to be researched on how this pedagogic paradigm became so dominant.]

The advantages of this approach have been well-documented. In brief they are

a] it is an approach that is powerful; it works.
b] it encourages focused attacks upon key knowledge and skills
c] it can be used by professionals, classroom aides and parents

The disadvantages are
a] its very potency can be a threat to a child's self determinancy

b] the requirement of carefully specified objectives can lead to the specification of those behaviours which are easiest to specify and achieve leaving less tangible but no less important outcomes [self-esteem] marginalised [6]

c] objective procedures and manipulated consequences are essentially totalitarian in character and negate self-determination and choice. [I suppose Skinner would argue that you could develop a programme which would reinforce choice behaviour; in other words people could be brain-washed into freedom and democracy.]

d] structured learning is in the hands of both professionals and non-professionals in every day situations. One LEA is training its 'dinner-ladies' in behavioural techniques to control children. The placing of powerful techniques in the hand of amateurs is not without its problems.

Why question success?

5.Objectives on the Route to Aims?

If the structured learning approach has become the dominant paradigm in the special needs field and if it can be demonstrated [as it has been] that the approach produces the intended changes in behaviour, then why is it being challenged? In part, it is challenged in relation to the extent to which it facilitates or hinders progress towards the broader 'aims' of education rather than the narrower 'objectives' of teaching.

The structured learning model with objectives specifically defined and arranged sequentially and hierarchically has the intention of enabling pupils to reach pre-specified outcomes. The teacher's role is one of effective planning of the incremental steps towards those outcomes. It was an implied educational outcome that the increments of planned objectives would lead the SLD pupil from incapacity and dependency towards autonomy and independence. Functional skills were seen as the passport to independent living in the mainstream of social life and these were acquired incrementally via the programme and under the supervision of the teacher.

The issue for me is this; is it possible to train for autonomy; is it possible to programme a pupil into independence?

How does the objectives model and skills analysis paradigm with its emphasis on the pupil reaching the objectives pre-set by the teachers facilitate true autonomy and independence? Can we condition pupils to be free? If there is a relationship between product and process what is that relationship in the case of pupils whose experience of learning is radically different from the aims of their education?

Important marker variables in this debate are that of incidental learning, extrapolation and generalisation. It is still possible to read in psychology and education texts in which the 'deficits' of SLD and MLD pupils in the area of incidental learning and generalisation are held up as though they were incontrovertibly characteristics of a particular sub-species of our race. I now wonder if we should not examine these so-called 'characteristics' as, in part, the distinctive products of a particular socialisation programme.

6.Others share this view

While considering this and related matters I became aware that other people were concerned. For example, a head of a special school began to inquire why the longstanding programme to 'develop social skills' seemed not to produce the range of flexible reactions to contexts and situations which ordinary living requires. His investigation led him to conclude that the manner of instruction was itself producing the behaviour constrictions observed in pupils when exposed to novel or different situations and problems. This led him to reject the behavioural paradigm and to begin planning a alternative programme based on social learning theories.

I then met a teacher of SLD pupils who was on her own in her school in wishing to introduce methods of teaching reading which drew upon the approaches more conventionally associated with the ordinary Infant school. Her concern was that the

mechanistic and programmed approaches in operation were producing mechanistic readers. She expressed this as 'wanted to be more normal in my way of working'. [Given the latest grumble about the Word-Recognition standards of seven year olds her views are likely to be even less popular]

Then I read a piece by Howard Sharron which added something else to these thoughts.[7] In a paper on the objectives model in a special school which was very supportive and appreciative of the care which had gone into planning pupils programmes there was an almost casual remark about the impact on the curriculum of the objectives-skills analysis model.

> 'Despite rigorous planning and assessment that goes into the curriculum, staff remain dissatisfied. Judith Coupe [Headteacher , Melland School] points out that the behavioural approach employed by the school imposes a great deal of external pressure on children to learn, often backed up by a system of rewards for children to achieve what the teacher wants. This does not instil an intrinsic desire to learn and to make progress, and there are also doubts about whether these precision teaching methods invest children with the ability to easily generalise the skills they learn in one context to another. To this extent ...the school wants to go beyond behaviourism' [p21]

Here was food for thought; if process and product are inter-related what is the 'teacher-product' which emerges after many years of immersion in the process of delivering a precise and pre-specified curriculum? The concept of 'deformation' hovers uneasily here.

It was about this time I began to meet teachers who were depressed about the way structured teaching had dominated their work to the extent that they felt they system was working them!

The Shears and Woods book has done much to open up these and related issues.[8] Just a few quotations from that book will be sufficient to capture the flavour of their argument

> 'We are not suggesting that the tasks and skills children with severe learning difficulties are taught in school under the new orthodoxy [structured learning] are of no value, or that they may not be useful in later life.....we are suggesting...that such an education does not add up to learning to be independent....[it] ..actually teaches teacher dependence' [p41].

and

> 'the objectives/skills analysis approach parades its educational programme as if it had concluded the educational debate concerning what education for SLD children should be' [P55]

and

> 'The teacher's role [in the new orthodoxy] as organiser of highly structured individual programmes involving direct teaching in the behaviourist mode, creates 'normal appearances' of children paying attention, and being busy....the skills analysis approach to curriculum content provides children with skills which make them look more normal'[p78]

In arguing for a re-appraisal of product and process we must not get caught in a romantic and impractical day-dream.

Jenny Corbett in 'The quality of life in the 'independence' curriculum' deals powerfully with the issues which 'independence' training for handicapped young people in community colleges raises. [9] She suggests that while autonomy and independence are noble goals they have to reconciles with realistic assessment of pupil's and student's physical and mental limits together with a realistic assessment of the actual levels of support which are within the community. She notes that while the academically gifted disabled students are being integrated students with severe physical and mental disabilities are increasingly the ones offered an 'independence curriculum'. The danger she points to is that such a curriculum, conceived in idealism, can be 'dishonest'if it is either too demanding or based on assumptions of levels of community care which are fictive.

> 'Despite the evident commitment of staff, this pattern can become another form of oppression, as damaging as the rejected model of institutional care' [p159]

This too can be seen in the light of the process-product dimension. For Corbett, the mere grafting of a package of independence skills in the expectation of normalisation without examining the available support systems or leaving unexamined the whole notion of the 'identity' of the disabled youngster makes the whole enterprise a problematic one.

> 'As part of the <u>training for independent living</u> we surely have to prepare students for an uncaring community, in a harsh society, in which their status as a person with disabilities makes them powerless and vulnerable. Is this the unbearable reality what[sic] the <u>choice</u> of <u>normalisation</u> is about?'[p159]

7. Defining teachers;the reflective practitioner

Let me repeat an earlier point; no pedagogy is neutral. When teachers are invited or inducted into a course of classroom action it is essential that those promoting a view clarify the assumptions, intentions and potential outcomes. One aspect of this is to clarify what is meant by the act of teaching.

I have found Christine O'Hanlon's work helpful in this regard.[10] She takes as her starting point the notion that teaching is a process which involves teachers being 'critical' and when is 'unpacked' means teachers being reflective, investigating their own practice, being involved in change and so on to another action-reflection cycle. She sees some teachers attempting to 'make sense' of the context in which they work. This has both personal and professional aspects; it involves processes which include examining the narrow box of the classroom and at the same time transcending it by engagement with socio-political issues at the medial [school] and macro [society] levels.

One outcome of this is the revealed mismatch between the 'claimed and the real', exposing contradictions and inconsistencies in policies and practices yielding possibilities for challenge or change.

As a result of dialogue with special needs teachers O'Hanlon identified a set of polarised attitudes and roles which were not associated with stereotyped individuals but which operated as tensions within the individual teacher. These aspects of the role were

a] humanitarian, anti-authoritarian and concerned with pastoral issues

and those which were

b] skill-based actions, specialist in character, expert, technical and 'professional'

Individual teachers experienced a tension between their immediate feelings and intuitions about pupils and their perceived status of being a skilled and technical expert.

O'Hanlon defines the 'Intuitionist teacher as one primarily concerned with relationships, the processes of schooling, teaching and learning; means and ends are defined subjectively in relationship or interactive terms. These attitudes often go with a willingness to challenge institutional norms.

The 'Teacher-technician' on the other hand is one primarily concerned with professional techniques, is mainly interested in results , the products of schooling, quantifiable outcomes,

with techniques defined in objective terms and an ready acceptance of institutional norms.

It can be presented as an interesting question whether the socialisation of teachers into a technicist role is a specification for the limitation of the reflective aspects of the role leading to an acceptance of a 'delivery' model of teaching in which the only significant question is 'how do we teach it'? and where the 'why' questions are seen as irrelevant.

9. The Training and Education of Teachers

I do not want to go into detail about the funding of teacher training but to express a concern from the point of view of someone who sees himself in the Education business of which Training is part but not the whole enterprise. Without being too melodramatic I do see what is happening to teacher professional development as part of the whole apparatus of centralised control over education. I think that there is a belief that the control of training is an important part of the central grip. The rigour with which the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education fashions initial teacher training, the explicit demands of the core and foundation subjects within the National Curriculum, the parcelling out of training funds to schools under the rubric of freedom and choice while obliging them to address others' agendas and the severing of the free association between LEAs and institutes of Higher Education and its replacement with 'market forces' all suggest to me that teacher professional development is likely to be lop-sided and imbalanced.

There are pressures to eradicate the 'education' of teachers in favour of a 'training programme' and to remove students in initial courses from the malign influence of institutions of Higher Education. Critics who take this line usually peddle the 'theory - practice' argument. Certainly within training institutions this debate creates tensions within staff as to the central purposes of initial training [training for a specific task or a more general education].

Its thrust is and will be towards the specified objective and the technicist role. Resources and the pressure of events will force schools and LEAs to orient their training towards technical and pragmatic ends. The opportunities for the reflective practitioner [O'Hanlon's concept] who challenges institutional norms will be limited in favour of more instrumental ends.

A recent HMI report on teacher training [11] has a number of wise things to say about teacher training and especially about enhancing the role of schools in that process and extending the role of the training institutions into the induction period. However the language of the report makes one uneasy;

it is full of words like 'employers', 'trainers', [not teachers, schools and pupils] not surprising since the report was in part based on the views of management trainers from BP International, IBM UK and Lloyds Bank PLC operating as the report has it as 'occasional inspectors'. The report oscillates between 'education' and 'training' in a cavalier manner as in the following quotation

> 'To what extent might the design of teacher education courses benefit from an explicit statement of job-related competencies of the kind familiar in managerial and industrial training?'[p12]

It goes to say it is also concerned with students 'general intellectual development' which is later defined as an understanding of one or more subjects in the school curriculum and how to adapt that knowledge to the needs of pupils. So intellectual development is rationed to methods of curriculum delivery. This is not surprising since we have a Secretary of State who is on record as supporting a view that a liberal education is one of the prime causes our national economic condition. He agrees with the Institute of Directors that an 'education which humanises our inner nature is useless' and that work experience could rationally begin with seven year olds. [The Guardian, 29/6/90, p6]

Our teachers are likely to find that they are at the receiving end of a structured curriculum [the new orthodoxy] with specified objectives and will we be concerned about the 'product' that emerge from such a 'process'?

One of the difficulties with concepts like 'explicit statements of job-related competencies' is that it tends to imply a static world view. Just imagine what a teacher training programme based on such competencies would have been like prior to 1987? How much relevance would such 'explicit' statements have for the teacher in training in 1991?

My own Department is celebrating its centenary as a training institution and we were reminded that the teachers we are currently turning out will still be teaching in 2030. What kind of training will sustain professional development if it is narrowly conceived in terms of current preoccupations?

After one of our celebratory seminars a colleague [12] wrote to me and here is an extract;

> 'Perhaps a Department of Education is so vulnerable because it does not produce tangible products, it's always only equipping people so that the ground for tangible products to emerge 'arts- economy-industry- is prepared. ....Profit in and out of education is never direct. No instant gratification. Nothing to buy and sell over the counter...[nothing Instant]

> The products of a department of education are teaching and teachers. It makes its products from the ideas people have accumulated over the centuries...a department of education so long as it does not generate ideas that illuminate and therefore enlighten the human condition will not survive the currently operating slaughter on higher education. 'Finding a voice' that does not imitate the ephemeral yet takes account of it and keeps it in its vision and in the place where it belongs, is demonstrating good judgement.'

She goes to argue that the current climate is hostile to training institutions which attempt to sustain a noble vision of their role ['equipping its students with the judgement and desire for life in a world without hunger, without ignorance, without sickness, without hate, without poverty a life without oppression'] In the constriction to conform to a centralised view of training departments are deflected from an important part of their mission and this deflection may be deliberate

> 'If it is manifestly prevented from analysing and reflecting upon the human condition, the body of ideas upon which it thrives, shrivels. To acquiesce is to witness this process knowingly and remain passive in the light of it instead of developing appropriate forms of resistance and continually refining those; debate, discussion, intellectual discourse, persuasion and argument'

In supporting this line as strongly as I do one must avoid the trap of seeming to renounce the importance of the relevant, the practical and pressing needs of the moment. The present danger is that we might be forced to do nothing else.

The danger I see is in the production of Reactive Teachers rather than Reflective ones. By reactive teachers I mean no disrespect here but to note the sheer pace of change , the volume of new demands and the severe limits on resources which could mean that teachers will be forced to become reactive to the latest fiat from central government. Teacher education itself will become a branch of crisis management and an agent of centralisation.

Among the worrying aspects of current teacher preparation is the readiness of some students to accept the narrow definition of teaching implied by HMIs report. English subject specialist students who openly state that all they need to know is in the Cox Report alarm me with their self-defined job competencies. This, of course, is only one aspect of a more general malaise captured by Kevin Eames, a teacher at Wootton Bassett School [13]

> 'It may be argued also that the professional autonomy of teachers is now under attack in the imposition of curriculum objectives and testing procedures, reducing us to technicians who sullenly administer other people's solutions, in predetermined doses, to our pupils. Teachers' morale has further been depressed by the removal of our pay negotiating rights, and by the constant, politically-inspired vilification we receive in the popular press' [p23]

It is heartening to see the NUT [14] arguing the following

> 'The underlying premise of the National Curriculum is that the curriculum consists largely of knowledge which must be passed on or 'delivered' by teachers to pupils. It is ...inappropriate to adult life, where people are faced with a series of challenges in the work place and else where, requiring the ability to make use of a range of skills, experiences and understandings as well as knowledge....the ability to interact imaginatively, creatively and spiritually with the world and its environment'

[N.B. Compare this view with that expressed by the Institute of Directors, above]

The NUT document has little or nothing to say about professional development but it is not possible for teachers to help to produce

> ' [all] young people with the ability to solve problems independently and collaborative, with communication skills of a high order and with the confidence to participate fully in society'

without a vision of the kind of professional and personal development need by teachers to meet this challenge.

I do not believe that such professional and personal development, [which may well involve preparation for high level management] can be satisfactorily provided over a career span only by means of a diet of short in-service courses or the accumulation of 'Baker Days'.

In its latest synoptic review of Special Educational Needs by HMI [15] there is an interesting comment, viz

> 'Overall, there have been many INSET developments in accord with the recommendations of the Warnock report. There is an increased variety of short courses on offer, and their relevance to serving

> teachers has increased, but the increase in number of courses on offer has not yet been sufficient to enable the majority of serving teachers to avail themselves of them.'

and

> 'The availability of substantial award bearing courses for those wishing to specialise in work with the SEN has increased, partly because of the shift to part-time modular courses, often run outside school hours, at the expense of one-year courses. Whether the marked reduction in full-time courses will ultimately be of significance to the profession has yet to be seen, but it would seem unwise to allow them to disappear altogether'[p 23]

There is a danger that like teachers and schools institutions of Higher Education will become reactive agents; the pressure is on to go out into the market place and earn.

Yes, modular course have made their contribution by attempting to keep a lifeline open to a good match between the technicist and intuitionistic needs of the reflective practitioner but what is not stated in the HMI pamphlet is that much of this work and an increasing proportion of teachers are financing their own professional development.

Recently visiting a number of Universities as an External Examiner I heard the view that Departments of Education are focusing their attention upon the 'market' and some have concluded that the 'training-technicist' end of that market is being addressed by schools and LEAs and that Higher Education can make an training input at that level as well as generating income. However at the advanced studies level and Higher Degree levels these Departments see their potential clients as self-funded teachers. In other words access to the upper levels of professional development will be available to those who can afford it. There will National Health level care for the many and 'BUPA' for those who can go 'private'.

This Association has made a significant contribution to this debate with its pamphlet 'Guidelines to the content of teachers'courses in special educational needs'[16] indicating the range of experiences and learning which are seen as part of the on-going professional and personal needs of teachers in our field. That document sets out one view of the range and depth of training and education which are thought to be needed by career special educators.

There is no place to-day to discuss whether there should be a distinctive specialist professional 'special needs' qualification, or whether we go along with a 'diffusion' model

which asserts that when all subject specialist assume responsibility for the whole ability range specialist teachers will be redundant.

I do believe it as important for all teachers as well as those working with special pupils to have access to a well-planned and appropriately resourced programmes supportive of personal and professional development.

That as an ideal does not seem to be on the DES's agenda at the moment.

As far as Higher Education is concerned I have serious concerns about our role as one of providers of emergency INSET in response to school and LEA demands. Here we can make our case for the relevance of our offerings in practical situations. But we need to do more; we should negotiate with schools and LEAs so that within such INSET provision we make space for the kinds of reflective-critical inputs which can be made by those with a role which asserts the primacy of independence and autonomy. In concrete form I would be unwilling to take part in INSET on aspects of the National Curriculum which did not allow or even encourage me to take a robustly critical stance. In my experience many Heads and LEA managers of INSET are happy to enter into this kind of negotiation.

Similarly we need to address the growing idea expressed in some LEAs that teachers working for Higher Degrees [often in their own time] are engaged in development which can be regarded [and dismissed] as 'for purely personal ends' and as such not worthy of financial support. In the short term we need to develop the idea of a 'mixed-economy'; a mixture of self and LEA/school funding. Here support for teachers working within specified modules should be found leaving the individual teacher to carry some of the costs.

I think we [Higher Education] have to make provision for the teachers [including 'special educators'] who wish to go down the road of independent study if only to ensure that such courses remain viable until a more balanced view of teacher professional requirement emerges. But equally we have to engage with our teacher colleagues and their professional associations to develop ways of communicating our shared concerns about teacher professional development. The political process of recovering some of the ground lost to the centre looks less daunting than it did. The ERA is a two-edged sword. Increasingly it is becoming clearer that that there are limits to what teachers will have imposed upon them and that the whole enterprise is based on obtaining and keeping teacher good-will; concessions have been won, as in the case of Testing at 7+; what we have to do is to find some way of negotiating and dealing so that these matters can be kept on our professional agenda and on the DES's.

Summary

I have attempted to take a line of argument which asserts that in education there is a marked concordance between how we learn and what we learn. There is no possibility of sanitising the content from the method. This I have concluded is an issue at school-classroom level and for teacher education. This is a plea for the recognition in all these contexts of the relationship between styles of learning and outcomes. Reactive pupils, reactive teachers and reactive institutions of Higher Education; these are products of not engaging in what my colleague calls 'resistance'; their forms and future is another matter.

Notes and References

1.'Touchstones' [1989] National Foundation for Educational Research-Nelson.

2. Thomas.D. [1990] 'Out of the armchair and over the parapet; dilemmas for the professional educator -rubbishing or reinforcing the National Curriculum;. Liverpool Evaluation and Assessment Unit, Department of Education, University of Liverpool. [Copies from the author]

3.See MacLure, S. [1989] Education Reformed Hodder and Staughton

4. Freire, P. [1972] Pedagogy of the Oppressed Penguin Books. The classic source of the concept of the 'dialogical' relationship between teacher and learner.

5. Thomas, D. [1965] 'Modification to behaviour' Special Education;Forward Trends 54, 9-12.

6. Yule, W. and Carr, J. [eds] [1980] Behaviour modification for people with mental handicaps 2nd Edition Croom Helm. Chapter 15 contains an admirable summary of the ethical issues associated with behaviour modification.

7.Sharron, H. [1986] 'A question of objectives' Special Children Issue 4 Oct 1986, pp 18-21

8. Woods, S. and Shears,B.[1986] Teaching children with severe learning difficulties; a radical reappraisal Croom Helm

9.Corbett, J. [1989] 'The quality of life in the 'Independence' curriculum. Disability, Handicap and Society 4, 2, pp 145-164.

10. O'Hanlon, C.[1988] 'Alienation within the profession; special needs or watered down teachers?' In, Critical

reflections on special education Johnstone, D. and O'Hanlon, C, [eds] Edge Hill College, Ormskirk, England.

11. HMI [1990] Perspectives on teacher education;other trainers'views Spring 1989, Department of Education and Science.

12. Ms Waltraud Boxall. Personal Communication

13. Eames, K.[1989] Review of 'Studies in School Self-Evaluation' in British Educational Research Association Newsletter 'Research Intelligence' No 32 Summer 1989 pp 21-23

14. NUT [1990] A strategy for the curriculum National Union of Teachers, London.
15. HMI [1990] Special Needs Issues; a survey by HMI Education Observed Series. London HMSO

16.NCSE [1990] Guidelines to the content of teachers' courses in special educational needs National Council for Special Education. Stratford upon Avon.